

**Remarks**

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 27-46 are in the case. Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 18-22 are canceled without prejudice hereinabove. Claims 27-46 are added hereinabove. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 – 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kralowetz, et al in view of Lahtinen. Claims 13, and 18-22 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kralowetz, et al in view of Pohjakallio.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that Kralowetz, et al. "...suggest...:" that the proxy engine is at or even above the application protocol layer. For the reasons stated in the preliminary amendment Filed April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2000 and in the amendment filed January 17, 2000.

However, Applicants request that claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 18-22 be cancelled without prejudice, and claims 27-46 be added. Claims 27-46 limit the application protocol layer to the short message service application protocol layer and these claims limit the reference parameter corresponding to the position of the fragments in the message to be a reference parameter corresponding to a number indicating the position of the fragments in the message. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 27-46 are allowable.

Claims 27-46 are supported by the specification as originally filed including originally filed claims and Figures.

Particularly, Claim 27 is supported for example on page 2, lines 27-33, page 7, lines 10-22 and lines 23-33, and page 5, lines 5-24, of the specification, which states that a short message entity divides the message (page 5, lines 3-6) at the application protocol layer (page 5, lines 12-14) of the short message entity, which is the short message service (SMS) application protocol layer.

Claim 28 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 4-22, 5, lines 29-32, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 29 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 4-22.

Claim 30 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 9-33, page 3, lines 1-6, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 31 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 23-33, page 3, lines 1-6, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 32 is supported in the specification on, for example, page 2, lines 27-33, page 7, lines 10-22 and lines 23-33, and page 5, lines 5-24.

Claim 33 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 5, lines 1-5.

Claim 34 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 4-22, 5, lines 29-32, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 35 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 4-22.

Claim 36 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 9-33, page 3, lines 1-6, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 37 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 23-33, page 3, lines 1-6, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 38 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 2, lines 27 through page 3, line 5, page 7, lines 4-33, and page 5, lines 1-24.

Claim 39 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 5, lines 3-5.

Claim 40 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 9-33, page 3, lines 1-6, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 41 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 23-33, page 3, lines 1-6, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 42 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 11, lines 28-29.

Claim 43 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 4, line 30 through page 5, line 3, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 44 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 10, lines 15 through page 11, line 2, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 45 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 4-22, 5, lines 29-32, and the claims as originally filed.

Claim 46 is supported in the specification, on, for example, page 7, lines 4-22.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the prior art in the related earlier application Serial No. 08/572,481 has been reviewed as required by M.P.E.P. § 2001.06(b). As stated in § 2001.06(b) "no separate citation of the same prior art need be made in the later application."

If there are any outstanding issues, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at 908-582-2188 to discuss this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Benson S. Ayabe  
Sharat Subramaniyam Chander  
Semyon B. Mizikovsky

Irena Lager  
Irena Lager  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registry No. 39260

Lucent Technologies Inc.  
Date: January 4, 2002